Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV - 3 1997
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 97 770

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1997

TEXACO, INC.,

Petitioner,

vs.

MATTHEWS SMITH, *et al.*,

Respondents.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

PAUL W. GERTZ
GERMER & GERTZ, L.L.P.
805 Park Street
Beaumont, Texas 77701
(409) 838-2080

STEPHEN F. FINK
Counsel of Record
DAVID M. PRYOR
THOMPSON & KNIGHT, P.C.
1700 Pacific Avenue
Suite 3300
Dallas, Texas 75201
(214) 969-1120

JOSEPH P. MOAN
TEXACO INC.
2000 Westchester Avenue
White Plains, New York 10650
(914) 253-7206

Attorneys for Petitioner

72353
(800) 3 APPEAL • (800) 5 APPEAL • (800) BRIEF 21
Lutz Appellate Services, Inc.

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether federal courts have the power to issue property-freeze injunctions when the affected property consists of documents and electronically stored information that may contain evidence relevant to a pending or anticipated civil action.

LIST OF PARTIES

The petitioner is Texaco Inc. Texaco Inc. does not have a parent corporation. Texaco Inc.'s nonwholly owned subsidiaries are Chemplex Construction Corporation, El Capitan Mutual Water Company, Four Star Oil + Gas Company, and Texaco NPI Holdings.

The named respondents are Matthews Smith, Karen Love, Darlene Greene, Kenneth Ford, John Lumpkins, and John Comeaux. Respondents also represent a putative class of similarly-situated persons.

Star Enterprise, co-defendant and co-appellant in the courts below, is also a named respondent.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Question Presented	i
List of Parties	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Table of Citations	iv
Opinions Below	1
Statement of Jurisdiction	1
Statute Involved	1
Statement of the Case	2
Reasons for Granting the Writ	4
I. The Decision Below Is In Conflict With Decisions Of This Court.	4
II. This Case Presents An Issue Of Substantial Importance To The Civil Justice System.	11
Conclusion	18

Contents

Page

TABLE OF CITATIONS

Cases Cited:

Ashland Chemical, Inc. v. Barco, Inc., 123 F.3d 261 (5th Cir. 1997) 8

De Beers Consolidated Mines v. United States, 325 U.S. 212 (1945) 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14

FDIC v. Faulkner, 991 F.2d 262 (5th Cir. 1993) 7

Federal Savings & Loan Ins. Corp. v. Dixon, 835 F.2d 854 (5th Cir. 1987) 7

Gaines v. Chew, 43 U.S. (Howe) 619, 629 (1844) 12

HJB, Inc. v. American Home Products Corp., 1994 WL 31005 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 1, 1994) 13

Humble Oil & Ref. Co. v. Harang, 262 F. Supp. 39 (E.D. La. 1966) 12

In re Fredeman Litigation, 843 F.2d 821 (5th Cir. 1988) 7

In re Orthopedic Bone Screw Prods. Liability Litigation, 1995 WL 925978 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 13, 1995) 13

In re Potash Antitrust Litigation, 1994 LEXIS 20836 (D. Minn. Dec. 5, 1994) 13

Contents

	Page
In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am. Sales Practices Litigation, 169 F.R.D. 598 (D.N.J. 1997)	13, 14
In re San Juan Dupont Plaza Hotel Fire Litigation, 859 F.2d 1007 (1st Cir. 1988)	8
ITT Community Development Corp. v. Barton, 569 F.2d 1351 (5th Cir. 1978)	6, 7
Millinocket Theatre, Inc. v. Kurson, 39 F. Supp. 979 (D. Me. 1941)	16
Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co. v. Cargill, 1995 WL 783610 (D. Minn. Oct. 20, 1995)	13
Pressey v. Patterson, 898 F.2d 1018 (5th Cir. 1990)	12
Richmark Corp. v. Timber Falling Consultants, Inc., 730 F. Supp. 1525 (D. Ore. 1990)	16
Schmid v. Milwaukee Elec. Tool Corp., 13 F.3d 76 (3rd Cir. 1994)	12
Seattle Times Co. v. Rhinehart, 467 U.S. 20 (1984)	6
Shepherd v. American Broadcasting, Inc., 62 F.3d 1469 (D.C. Cir. 1995)	12
Uniguard Sec. Ins. Co. v. Lakewood Eng'g & Mfg. Corp., 982 F.2d 363 (9th Cir. 1992)	12

Contents

	Page
United States v. First City Nat. Bank, 379 U.S. 378 (1965)	7
Wooley v. Maynard, 430 U.S. 705 (1977)	6
Statutes Cited:	
18 U.S.C. § 401(3)	16
28 U.S.C.A. §§ 471-482	8
28 U.S.C. § 1254	1
28 U.S.C. § 1503	16
42 U.S.C. § 1981	1, 2
42 U.S.C. § 2000e *et seq.*	1
Rules Cited:	
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11	15, 16
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16	9
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(c)(12)	9
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26	8, 15
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 27(a)	8

Contents

	Page
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34	8
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37	8
Other Authorities Cited:	
29 C.F.R. § 1602.14	13
Dale A. Oesterle, *A Private Litigant's Remedies for an Opponent's Inappropriate Destruction of Relevant Documents*, 61 TEX. L. REV. 1185 (1983)	10, 13, 16
EEOC COMPLIANCE MANUAL § 632.3(b)(2)(ii)	13
Lawrence B. Solum & Stephen J. Marzen, *Truth and Uncertainty: Legal Control of the Destruction of Evidence*, 36 EMORY L.J. 1085 (1987)	13
Rand Corporation, *Just, Speedy, and Inexpensive? An Evaluation of Judicial Case Management Under the Civil Justice Reform Act* (1997)	15
5A CHARLES A. WRIGHT *ET AL.*, FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE § 1331 (Supp. 1996)	15
MANUAL FOR COMPLEX LITIGATION	10, 11, 13

Contents

Page

APPENDIX

Appendix A — Per Curiam Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Filed June 3, 1997 ..... 1a

Appendix B — Preliminary Injunction of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Beaumont Division Filed January 2, 1997 ..... 2a

Appendix C — Memorandum Opinion of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Beaumont Division Filed January 2, 1997 ..... 5a

Appendix D — Document Preservation Order of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Beaumont Division Filed March 4, 1997 ..... 16a

Appendix E — Per Curiam Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Denying Petition for Rehearing Filed August 5, 1997 ..... 21a

Appendix F — Scheduling Order of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey in the Matter of *In re The Prudential Insurance Company of America Sales Practices Litigation*, Master Docket No. 95-4704 Entered September 15, 1995 ..... 23a

Petitioner Texaco Inc. ("Texaco" or "the Company") respectfully prays that this Court grant a writ of certiorari to review the judgment and opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit entered on June 3, 1997.

OPINIONS BELOW

The unreported opinion of the Fifth Circuit is set out at page 1a of the Appendix. The unreported decision of the court of appeals denying rehearing and rehearing *en banc* is set out at pages 21a-22a of the Appendix. The district court's January 2, 1997 opinion and order granting a preliminary injunction, which is reported at 951 F. Supp. 109 (E.D. Tex. 1997), is set out at pages 2a-15a of the Appendix. The district court's unreported "document-preservation order," dated March 4, 1997, is set out at pages 16a-20a of the Appendix.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

The decision of the Fifth Circuit was entered on June 3, 1997. Texaco's petition for rehearing was denied on August 5, 1997. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1254.

STATUTE INVOLVED

Respondents sued under 42 U.S.C. § 1981 and 42 U.S.C. § 2000e *et seq.* But interpretation of those statutes is not the concern of this certiorari petition, which seeks review of ancillary property-freeze injunctions entered by the district court and affirmed by the Fifth Circuit. Neither court identified by what authority the disputed orders were entered.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The district court entered an injunction (which was subsequently stayed by the Fifth Circuit), then later a nearly identical order, enjoining Texaco, *pendente lite*, from altering or disposing of what is indisputably its own property: existing and future documents and electronically stored information. No statute or rule of civil procedure grants courts the authority to enter such property-freeze injunctions, and opinions of this Court place them beyond the farthest reach of the courts' equitable powers.

On December 6, 1996, Smith obtained an *ex parte* temporary restraining order from a state judge in Jefferson County, Texas; the order required Texaco, as well as its affiliate and co-defendant, Star Enterprise ("Star"), to retain, unaltered, a vast array of existing and future information concerning their employment practices. I R. 6-10, 14-15, 22-25.[1] Because the application made allegations that could support claims arising under only 42 U.S.C. § 1981 or Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Star removed the action to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Beaumont Division, on December 10; Texaco joined in that removal. I R. 1-3, 41.

On January 2, 1997, the district court issued a memorandum opinion and an order granting a preliminary injunction against Texaco. (App. 2a-15a). The injunction prohibited Texaco from moving, altering, or destroying any documents or electronic media "involved in" the discriminatory practices alleged by Smith. (App. 3a). Texaco filed a motion to stay the preliminary injunction on January 9. I R. 199-207. Smith filed a response to Texaco's motion to stay on January 23. I R. 225-236. Nine

---

1. The abbreviation "R." refers to the record filed below; "SR." refers to the supplemental record. The preceding Roman numeral refers to the volume. The subsequent Arabic number designates the page.

minutes after Smith filed his response, the district court entered an order denying Texaco's motion for stay because granting them

> would permit the defendant Star to continue to transfer defendants' Texaco files beyond the jurisdiction of this court [to Texaco's Oklahoma storage facility], and make them, as a practical matter, virtually inaccessible to plaintiff and those similarly situated.

I R. 238-41.

On February 4, Smith filed his first amended complaint, alleging only section 1981 claims against Texaco and Star. I SR. 21-36. That same day Texaco filed with the Fifth Circuit a motion to stay the preliminary injunction or, in the alternative, to expedite the appeal of the order granting the injunction. While Texaco's motion to stay the preliminary injunction was pending, Smith filed a motion for a "document-preservation order" ("Motion"). I SR. 37-40. The Motion asked the district court to enter an order with language identical to that contained in the preliminary injunction and to style the relief as an "order" rather than as a "preliminary injunction." Before the district court acted on the Motion, the Fifth Circuit entered an order staying the preliminary injunction. I SR. 41-42.

On March 4, the district court entered an order requiring Texaco to preserve documents "related to" this action. (App. 16a-20a). Texaco filed notice of its intent to appeal that order, and later filed a motion asking the Fifth Circuit to stay the order and to consolidate that order's appeal with the appeal of the preliminary injunction. I SR. 155-156.

With the "document-preservation order" safely in place, Smith moved, on March 19, to dissolve the preliminary injunction. I SR. 175-177. On the morning of March 21 Texaco's

counsel notified the district court by telephone that the Company wished to respond to the motion to dissolve. At approximately 1:00 p.m. the same day, Texaco received by facsimile transmission a copy of the district court's order both conditionally granting the motion to dissolve and referring that motion to the Fifth Circuit. I SR. 191-192. The Fifth Circuit subsequently entered an order that consolidated the appeal of the "document-preservation order"[2] with the appeal of the preliminary injunction, denied Texaco's motion to stay, and expedited the appeal.

The Fifth Circuit heard oral argument on June 3, 1997. The panel ruled from the bench, affirming the district court. A one-word per curiam opinion — "Affirmed" — issued later that day. (App. 1a). A timely suggestion for rehearing *en banc* was denied on August 5, 1997. (App. 21a-22a).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

I.

THE DECISION BELOW IS IN CONFLICT WITH DECISIONS OF THIS COURT.

The ability to levy taxes and raise an army would unquestionably assist a district court in disposing of the business that comes before it. But a court lacks the *power* to take those actions. For the same reason, the district court could not validly enter the disputed property-freeze injunctions. That such injunctions can be rationalized as convenient, or as likely to improve the accuracy of adjudication, is not enough to expand the federal courts' historically constrained equitable powers.

---

2. Texaco contended below, and the court of appeals evidently accepted, that the "document-preservation order" is in substance an injunction. Texaco will hereafter refer simply to the "injunctions."

When the property at issue is not itself the subject of the underlying litigation, an order prohibiting its free enjoyment *pendente lite* is facially invalid. This Court held as much in *De Beers Consolidated Mines v. United States*, 325 U.S. 212 (1945). The *De Beers* holding applies fully to the property-freeze injunctions at issue here.

In *De Beers*, this Court reviewed under the All Writs Act, and vacated as a "usurpation of power" by the district court, an injunction, entered at the outset of the action, that ordered the defendants not to move, transfer, or dispose of certain of their property until the lawsuit was over. 325 U.S. at 222-23. The Court held that the injunction was not authorized either by statute or the "usages of equity" and so was unlawful without regard to whether it satisfied the normal requirements for the issuance of an injunction. *Id.*

De Beers recognized only two exceptions to the general rule that a court may not freeze a litigant's property simply because a lawsuit is pending: when the injunction "deals with property which can be dealt with in any final injunction" and when the injunction "grant[s] intermediate relief of the same character as that which may be granted finally." *Id.* at 220. Neither exception applies here. Smith and the other plaintiffs do not assert any ownership or other property interest in the documents covered by the orders, or that any such interest will arise by virtue of the action. Nor does the underlying litigation question Texaco's right (after the litigation is over) to create, modify, and dispose of whatever documents or electronically stored information it chooses. Smith's lawsuit seeks monetary damages and promotional opportunities, not the right to tell Texaco how to manage its information-storage tools. Consequently, the Fifth Circuit's decision to affirm the district court could not have rested on the conclusion that the injunctions fall within either exception to *De Beers*.

Moreover, the disputed injunctions cannot be distinguished in any legally significant way from the injunction invalidated in *De Beers*. The purpose of the injunction there was to ensure that the eventual judgment or decree of the court could be carried out: that any judgment entered would be enforceable. Yet, even that indisputably important goal — meaningful adjudication — did not in this Court's view confer a general equitable power to freeze litigants' assets. In this case, the district court entered the injunctions presumably to safeguard the court's factfinding function. But no reasoned basis exists for concluding that the mere possibility of improved accuracy in adjudication confers broader equitable power than the interest found wanting in *De Beers*.

In fact, although *De Beers* found the defendants' property interest alone sufficient to override the countervailing concern with meaningful adjudication, Texaco's interest in its documents and electronically stored information includes, but also transcends, property. As this Court has recognized, the requirement to disclose information in civil litigation "may seriously implicate privacy interests of litigants and third parties." *Seattle Times Co. v. Rhinehart*, 467 U.S. 20, 34 (1984). Privacy includes "the right to refrain from speaking. . . ." *Wooley v. Maynard*, 430 U.S. 705, 714 (1977). The discovery rules, for example, validly limit privacy rights of litigants only to the extent necessary for effective prosecution or defense of the civil action. *Seattle Times*, 467 U.S. at 34-35. Because compelled retention increases the probability of eventual compelled disclosure, Texaco's privacy *and* property interests in its documents and electronically stored information are actually weightier than the property right involved in *De Beers*.

The continued vitality of *De Beers* is not in question. In *ITT Community Development Corp. v. Barton*,[3] for example, the

3. 569 F.2d 1351, 1360-61 (5th Cir. 1978).

Fifth Circuit applied *De Beers* to reverse a so-called turnover order, issued originally in the form of an injunction, that required the defendants to place some of their property in the registry of the court pending the final outcome of the case. Later, in *In re Fredeman Litigation*,[4] that court applied both *De Beers* and *Barton* to invalidate an injunction that "froze" some of the defendants' property pending the outcome of the case — notwithstanding allegations that the defendants were "scoundrels" who would go to any lengths to avoid satisfying whatever judgment was ultimately entered against them. In fact, the Fifth Circuit has not only properly analyzed *De Beers* on several occasions, it has also correctly pointed out that if sufficient need for a particular type of property-freeze injunction exists, the solution is congressional action to authorize by statute what would otherwise be beyond the courts' equitable powers.[5] This Court has recognized that same principle for more than thirty years.[6] But no existing statute or rule of civil procedure contemplates property-freeze injunctions of the type at issue here.

Smith suggested below that the Eastern District's Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Act Plan ("the Plan") — enacted pursuant to the Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990

---

4. 843 F.2d 821, 824-25 (5th Cir. 1988); *see also Federal Savings & Loan Ins. Corp. v. Dixon*, 835 F.2d 554 (5th Cir. 1987).

5. *In re Fredeman Litigation*, 843 F.2d at 828.

6. *See United States v. First City Nat. Bank*, 379 U.S. 378 (1965) (upholding asset-freeze injunction authorized by section 7402 of the Internal Revenue Code); *accord FDIC v. Faulkner*, 991 F.2d 262 (5th Cir. 1993) (upholding asset-freeze preliminary injunction entered pursuant to the Comprehensive Thrift and Bank Fraud Prosecution and Taxpayer Recovery Act of 1990).

("CJRA")[7] — authorized the district court to enter the injunctions. But neither the Plan nor the CJRA mentions property-freeze orders of any kind. Nor is there any basis for inferring the power to enter property-freeze injunctions from either the CJRA or the Plan.[8]

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure likewise do not authorize such injunctions. No Rule mentions enjoining the preservation of documentary evidence,[9] and the Rules most consistently proffered as justification for the injunctions — Rules 26, 34, and 37 — are no exception. Rule 26 discusses the methods and scope of discovery. Rule 34 governs only the *production* of documents; it does not sanction injunctive relief in any form. Rule 37 at least authorizes certain kinds of orders related to discovery, but the injunctions entered below were indisputably not "discovery orders."

> Traditionally, discovery orders resolve conflicts arising when a party, through the use of one of the enumerated discovery devices, seeks to gain information from an adverse party or a third person. A, for example, propounds an interrogatory to B; dissatisfied with the response — it seems incomplete, or evasive, or simply never materializes — A asks the judge to order that proper response be served.[10]

---

7. 28 U.S.C.A. §§ 471-482 (1993 & Supp. 1997).

8. *See Ashland Chemical, Inc. v. Barco, Inc.*, 123 F.3d 261, 268 (5th Cir. 1997) (noting that the CJRA does not authorize enactment of rules that are outside "the tenor of the CJRA's own specific provisions. . . .").

9. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26-37; *cf.* Fed. R. Civ. P. 27(a) (authorizing pre-action deposition to preserve *testimony*).

10. *In re San Juan Dupont Plaza Hotel Fire Litigation*, 859 F.2d 1007, 1012 (1st Cir. 1988).

The district court's injunctions are not such orders. They are not the end result of a discovery dispute. And even the district court made perfectly plain that its "document-preservation order" is not a *discovery* order:

> None of the three orders shall be considered by the parties or by this court a motion to produce any of the 'Preserved Documents,' or requiring any discovery *until a discovery order* is entered by the court after either agreement of the party, or upon motion and hearing, if necessary.

(App. 16a) (emphasis added).

In the Court of Appeals respondents' counsel suggested that Rule 16(c)(12)[11] allows property-freeze injunctions in "complex" cases. Rule 16(c)(12) does refer to special procedures necessary to manage complex litigation. It does not mention property-freeze injunctions. In any event, documents are no less important in simple than in "complex" cases, and there is no reason to believe that documents are more likely to be destroyed in "complex" litigation. Rule 16 no more authorizes property-freeze injunctions than does the CJRA.[12]

---

11. Rule 16(c)(12) provides that "a court may take appropriate action, with respect to . . . (12) the need for adopting special procedures for managing potentially difficult or protracted actions that may involve complex issues, multiple parties, difficult legal questions, or unusual proof problems." Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(c)(12).

12. Even a passionate proponent of increased protections against document destruction has characterized the argument that the power to enter "document-preservation orders" can be distilled from the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as follows: "on the edge of doctrinal respectability"; "procedural chicanery"; "transparent effort by the court to manipulate the text of the rule to satisfy its goals"; "defeats one of the primary purposes behind the Federal Rules and their authorizing

(Cont'd)

The principal "authority" cited below, and the true provenance of most recent evidence-freeze orders, is the MANUAL FOR COMPLEX LITIGATION ("Manual"). (App. 16a, 24a). But the Manual, by its own account, is neither "a treatise on matters of substantive or procedural law" nor "intended for citation as authority on points of law or as a statement of official policy."[13] Moreover, the Manual does not address specifically the statutory authority for such orders, confining itself instead to this general observation:

> Although not without limits, the court's express and inherent powers enable the judge to exercise extensive supervision and control of litigation. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, particularly Rules 16, 26, 37, 42, and 83, contain numerous grants of authority that supplement the court's inherent power to manage litigation. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(c)(12) specifically addresses complex litigation, authorizing the judge to adopt "special procedures for managing potentially difficult or protracted actions that may involve complex issues, multiple parties, difficult legal questions, or unusual proof problems."[14]

But as noted above, none of the specific Rules cited by the Manual discuss document-preservation injunctions. Perhaps

---

(Cont'd)
legislation, the Rules Enabling Act of 1934"; "courts are forced to search among obscure doctrines for scraps of precedent to support their holdings"; "strained"; "[t]he legal obligation of document retention defined by this process is uncertain and unintelligible." Dale A. Oesterle, *A Private Litigant's Remedies for an Opponent's Inappropriate Destruction of Relevant Documents*, 61 TEX. L. REV. 1185, 1222, 1224-25, 1231, 1239 (1983).

13. Manual, § 10.2, at 5 (3d ed. 1995).

14. Manual, at 10 (footnote omitted).

most significantly, the Manual does not acknowledge the conflict between the "document-preservation order" it suggests and this Court's decisions. The Manual's recommended "document-preservation order" is written in the form of an injunction.[15] Yet the Manual never mentions *De Beers* or its limitation of the courts' injunctive powers to those sanctioned by traditional usages of equity.

The purpose of the property-freeze injunctions was no doubt the worthy one of ensuring that as much relevant evidence as possible is available to the district court. But a district court is not free to squeeze even a useful power from every worthy goal. Until Congress — or this Court under its rulemaking authority — decides that the value of the goal outweighs the interference with the privacy and property rights of the litigant, the courts have no more power to issue property-freeze injunctions when the assets are documents or computer tapes than they do when the assets are cash or mining equipment.

II.

THIS CASE PRESENTS AN ISSUE OF SUBSTANTIAL IMPORTANCE TO THE CIVIL JUSTICE SYSTEM.

The validity of property-freeze injunctions aimed at documents and other putative evidence affects the entire civil justice system and is squarely at issue in this case. Given the apparent steep escalation in the use of such injunctions, this Court should issue a writ of certiorari to settle an important question concerning the power of federal courts.

Until relatively recently, virtually all courts recognized that one party's fear that potentially relevant documents in the

15. Manual § 41.34 (sample order using language such as "restrained and enjoined.")

possession of the opposing party would be lost or destroyed did not justify equitable relief. As one court put it:

> [w]ere the fact that a party to a law suit would suffer irreparable injury if a document were destroyed the sole test for the issuance of an injunction to prevent its destruction, injunctions should issue in every case in which important documents are within the control of either party. Obviously, this is not done and should not be done.

Humble Oil & Ref. Co. v. Harang, 262 F. Supp. 39, 42-43 (E.D. La. 1966). The court in *Harang* could describe its conclusion as "obvious" because it followed faithfully a centuries-old understanding of the limits on the equitable powers of federal district courts.[16] The same understanding underlay this Court's ruling in *De Beers*.

Adherence to *De Beers* and traditional limits on equity jurisdiction by no means rendered courts impotent when confronted with destruction of relevant evidence. Courts unquestionably have the authority in such situations to take curative actions up to, and including, dismissal or a default judgment.[17] Most commonly they draw, or allow a jury to draw, an adverse inference from so-called "spoliation" of evidence. Courts in the United States adopted the adverse-inference doctrine from English chancery practice,[18] and the Equal

16. *See Harang*, 262 F. Supp. at 43.

17. *See Shepherd v. American Broadcasting, Inc.*, 62 F.3d 1469, 1484 (D.C. Cir. 1995); *Schmid v. Milwaukee Elec. Tool Corp.*, 13 F.3d 76, 78-79 (3rd Cir. 1994); *Uniguard Sec. Ins. Co. v. Lakewood Eng'g & Mfg. Corp.*, 982 F.2d 363, 368 (9th Cir. 1992); *Pressey v. Patterson*, 898 F.2d 1018, 1022 (5th Cir. 1990).

18. *See Gaines v. Chew*, 43 U.S. (Howe) 619, 629 (1844) (explaining that at English common law the power of chancery extended to drawing an adverse inference because of the spoliation of papers).

Employment Opportunity Commission adopted it to aid in enforcement of the employment discrimination laws.[19]

But recently a number of courts have evidently lost faith in the adverse-inference doctrine. Or perhaps the proliferation of evidence-freeze orders and injunctions can be attributed to their endorsement by the influential Manual. Whatever the reason, many courts now routinely enter evidence-freeze injunctions indistinguishable from the injunctions at issue here.[20] In fact, some district courts apparently view document-freeze orders as so uncontroversial that they include them in routine scheduling orders.[21] Yet, no reported decision has addressed the legal basis

---

19. Where a respondent knowingly destroys or knowingly fails to maintain records in anticipation of filing the charge, or because of a Commission investigation, or otherwise with the intent to defeat the purposes of Title VII, the EOS can recommend drawing an "adverse inference" that the information destroyed or not maintained would have been unfavorable to the respondent. This adverse inference can be used, as to the evidence sought, to establish facts relevant to a determination on its merits.

EEOC COMPLIANCE MANUAL § 632.3(b)(2)(ii). *See also* 29 C.F.R. § 1602.14.

20. *See, e.g., In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am. Sales Practices Litigation*, 169 F.R.D. 598, 600 (D.N.J. 1997); *In re Orthopedic Bone Screw Prods. Liability Litigation*, 1995 WL 925978, * 1-2 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 13, 1995); *HJB, Inc. v. American Home Products Corp.*, 1994 WL 31005, * 1, n.1 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 1, 1994); *Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co. v. Cargill*, 1995 WL 783610, *3 (D. Minn. Oct. 20, 1995) (considering, but rejecting, motion for document-preservation order); *In re Potash Antitrust Litigation*, 1994 LEXIS 20836, * 30 (D. Minn. Dec. 5, 1994) (same); *see also* Lawrence B. Solum & Stephen J. Marzen, *Truth and Uncertainty: Legal Control of the Destruction of Evidence*, 36 EMORY L.J. 1085 (1987); Oesterle, 61 TEX. L. REV. at 1222, 1224-25.

21. *See In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am. Sales Practices Litigation*, No. 95-4704 (D.N.J. Sept. 15, 1995) (Scheduling Order) (set out at pages 21a-34a of the Appendix).

for the orders, much less the implications of *De Beers* and its progeny for their validity.

More disturbingly, neither the courts nor the commentators have taken any notice of the most substantial cost to the civil justice process of giving courts the power to fine or jail litigants who fail to preserve relevant evidence: the incentive it creates for litigants to try an opponent's evidence-preservation efforts rather than the merits of the action. Here, for example, it would be far easier to prove that one or two of Texaco's thousands of far-flung employees failed to preserve some documents or electronically stored information arguably "related to" the plaintiffs' as yet ill-defined claims than it would be to prove intentional race discrimination. And the psychic satisfaction of deposing all of Texaco's top managers about the company's document-management practices, then making the company pay for the exercise, for some could nearly equal the satisfaction of remedying alleged race discrimination.

The example is not fanciful or hyperbole. In *Prudential*,[22] technical violations of the court's document-preservation order resulted in extensive ancillary proceedings involving fifty-two depositions (including ones of all of the defendant's senior officers), a detailed order revising and editing the defendant's document-preservation policies, shifting all costs of the ancillary proceedings to the defendant, and imposing a $1,000,000 fine.[23]

The *Prudential* case may be the most recent and telling example of the phenomenon, but it is by no means the only evidence of it. The federal discovery rules have been amended three times, in 1980, 1983, and 1993, to "deal with the problem

22. *See In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am. Sales Practices Litigation*, 169 F.R.D. 598 (D.N.J. 1997).

23. *Id.* at 601, 616-17.

of overdiscovery."[24] As the Advisory Committee explained in 1983:

> The objective is to guard against redundant or disproportionate discovery . . . [and] to encourage judges to be more aggressive in identifying and discouraging discovery overuse. . . . The Court must apply the standards in an even-handed manner that will prevent use of discovery to wage a war of attrition or as a device to coerce a party, whether financially weak or affluent.

The aspirational standards adopted in 1983 proved inadequate to bridling "overdiscovery": the 1993 amendments therefore adopted more extreme measures still. But a recent independent study concluded that the 1993 measures, at least to the extent that it was hoped that aggressive case management by itself would reduce litigation cost and delay, have not worked either.[25]

The history of Rule 11 is equally illustrative.[26] In 1993 the Rule was amended "dramatically . . . to reduce the litigation that the prior rule had generated."[27] Of particular relevance here, a new subdivision (d) was added to remove from the ambit of the Rule all discovery issues. A principal concern addressed by the revisions was the incentives created by the Rule "for many unnecessary Rule 11 motions."[28] In substance the problem was

---

24. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26, *Advisory Committee Note to 1983 Amendments*.

25. Rand Corporation, *Just, Speedy, and Inexpensive? An Evaluation of Judicial Case Management Under the Civil Justice Reform Act* (1997).

26. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11.

27. 5A CHARLES A. WRIGHT *ET AL.*, FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE § 1331, at 2-4 (Supp. 1996).

28. *See* 146 F.R.D. 524 (1993).

this: given even a little encouragement to pursue another litigant or his counsel for misconduct, so many parties leapt at the chance that the real business of the courts was being impeded.

There is no reason to believe that the abuses that nearly sank Rule 11 will be any less prevalent if the newest weapon in the litigator's arsenal offers the prospect of both civil *and* criminal penalties. In short, evidence-freeze injunctions of the kind entered by the district court in this case open whole new vistas for time-consuming, expensive, and unproductive satellite litigation — vistas that litigants have shown they are all too ready to explore. This Court should exercise its oversight responsibilities for the civil justice system to resolve finally the question of the power of a district court to enter such injunctions.

* * *

There is no *right* to destroy documents relevant to pending civil litigation, and Texaco is not arguing otherwise. The question is whether district courts are vested with the *power* to enter property-freeze injunctions. Put another way, the question is whether the importance of documents and electronically stored information to civil adjudication requires or permits *criminalizing* a litigant's failure to preserve them when they may be relevant to a pending action. "Criminalizing" is not too strong a word, for a federal statute makes it criminal contempt in certain circumstances to impede or resist an order of a federal court, even if it was made in a civil action between two private parties.[29]

---

29. 18 U.S.C. § 401(3). *Compare Richmark Corp. v. Timber Falling Consultants, Inc.*, 730 F. Supp. 1525, 1532 (D. Ore. 1990) (absent a court order or subpoena, withholding or concealing documents in a civil action not obstruction of justice in violation of 28 U.S.C. § 1503); *Millinocket Theatre, Inc. v. Kurson*, 39 F. Supp. 979 (D. Me. 1941) (destruction of documents relevant to civil action not contempt of court). *See also* Oesterle, 61 TEX. L. REV. at 1201, 1205-06 & nn. 82-83.

Plaintiffs usually can choose when to commence a lawsuit and what averments they intend to make. Those tactical advantages would permit unhelpful documents to be "routinely" disposed of before the action commences in such a way that proving the destruction was anything else is virtually impossible. But large corporations such as Texaco cannot function without documents and other communication tools, and typically they have no control over when or for what they are sued. Moreover, the practical difficulties presented by the need to interpret, disseminate, and police compliance with orders to preserve documents and electronically stored information to a worldwide workforce of more than 25,000 are daunting.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, a writ of certiorari should issue to review the judgment and opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPHEN F. FINK
Counsel of Record
DAVID M. PRYOR
THOMPSON & KNIGHT, P.C.
1700 Pacific Avenue
Suite 3300
Dallas, Texas 75201
(214) 969-1120

PAUL W. GERTZ
GERMER & GERTZ, L.L.P.
805 Park Street
Beaumont, Texas 77701
(409) 838-2080

JOSEPH P. MOAN
TEXACO INC.
2000 Westchester Avenue
White Plains, New York 10650
(914) 253-7206

Attorneys for Petitioner

APPENDIX A — PER CURIAM OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT FILED JUNE 3, 1997

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 97-40087
Consolidated with
No. 97-40295

MATTHEWS SMITH,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

TEXACO, INC.; ET AL.,

Defendants,

STAR ENTERPRISES; TEXACO, INC.,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
For the Eastern District of Texas
(1:96-CV-749)

Before WIENER and PARKER, Circuit Judges, and LITTLE, District Judge.*

PER CURIAM:**

AFFIRMED. See Local Rule 47.6.

---

* United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, sitting by designation.

** Pursuant to Local Rule 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in Local Rule 47.5.4.

APPENDIX B — PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, BEAUMONT DIVISION FILED JANUARY 2, 1997

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BEAUMONT DIVISION

NO. 1:96-CV-0749

MATTHEWS SMITH, ET AL

V.

TEXACO INC., TEXACO CHEMICAL COMPANY, AND STAR ENTERPRISE, INC.

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

The presiding judge of the 172nd District Court District Court of Texas entered a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) without notice on December 6, 1996. On December 10, 1996, the defendants properly and timely removed this cause to this court, which set the matter for hearing at 2:00 p.m. on December 11, 1996, for possible modification or dissolution of the TRO, and set the hearing for a preliminary injunction to be held on December 20, 1996. The TRO entered by the state court remained in effect it was modified by this court. *Texas v. Wellington Resources Corp.*, 706 F.2d 533 (5th Cir. 1983).

The TRO entered by the state court, supported by affidavit, was modified on December 13, 1996. The parties agreed to continue the modified TRO in effect until the close of business January 3, 1997. The modified TRO is now dissolved, and a

preliminary injunction is hereby entered, based upon the facts as proved in the hearing, and for the reasons set forth in the Memorandum Opinion entered by this court on this date.

1. The defendants, Texaco Inc. and Star Enterprise, Inc. (including such defendants' agents, servants, representatives, insurers, and any other person or entity acting for or on behalf of said defendants, or any person having actual or constructive notice of this order) shall not destroy, alter, change, delete, or make any new notations on documents or electronic materials which were, in any way, involved in the discriminatory practices alleged by the plaintiffs. The defendants Texaco Inc. and Star Enterprise, Inc. (including such defendants' agents, servants, representatives, insurers, and any other person or entity acting for or on behalf of said defendants, or any person having actual or constructive notice of this order), may make any new additions or notations concerning payroll, or similar records which they have or will make in their usual and ordinary course of business. Defendants are moreover enjoined from moving documents or electronic materials which were, in any way, involved in any of the discriminatory practices alleged by the plaintiffs; except that, defendants may move certain documents or materials if doing so is necessary to advance the ordinary and usual business purposes of the defendants, as determined by both industry standards and any internal business standards or policies which defendants have previously imposed on themselves; provided, however, that any moving of such documents or materials shall not impair the plaintiffs' right to inspect such documents or materials, until further order of this court.

2. Any and all electronic communications involving the Human Resources Department of Star Enterprises shall be kept and not destroyed, unless hard paper copies are made and kept,

and the electronic tapes may be re-used as necessary. Such hard copies will be logged and indexed.

3. The defendants shall prepare and furnish logs of any and all documents which have been moved from Star-Port Arthur to Texaco at Tulsa, and any such records from Star's three other facilities in Louisiana, Delaware, and Georgia.

4. The defendant Star Enterprise shall log and index any and all records of employment changes in pay, benefits, promotions, changes of positions, demotions, or other pertinent employment decisions at all of its locations within the United States of America until further order of this court. All of these records (past, present, and future) shall be open to the plaintiff and his attorneys at mutually agreeable time during normal working hours upon five working days' notice. If the parties cannot mutually agree on such times for inspection, the court will set such times upon application of either party.

5. This order shall not become effective unless and until the plaintiff or his attorneys execute and file with the Clerk a bond, in conformity with law, in the amount of Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000) with a surety approved by the United States District Clerk, Eastern District of Texas, Beaumont, Texas. The bond shall be filed by the close of business January 7, 1997. If said bond is not so filed, this order is of no effect and the state court Temporary Restraining Order is dissolved, as is this temporary injunction.

SIGNED this 2nd day of January, 1997.

s/ Howell Cobb
HOWELL COBB
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

APPENDIX C — MEMORANDUM OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, BEAUMONT DIVISION FILED JANUARY 2, 1997

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BEAUMONT DIVISION

1:96CV749

MATTHEWS SMITH, ET AL,

PLAINTIFFS,

VS.

TEXACO, INC., TEXACO CHEMICAL COMPANY AND STAR ENTERPRISE, INC.,

DEFENDANTS

Memorandum Opinion

Before the court is Plaintiff Matthews Smith's (Smith) motion seeking to remand this case to state court, and defendants' Texaco, Inc. (Texaco) and Star Enterprise, Inc. (Star Enterprise) motions seeking to dissolve the temporary restraining order (TRO) previously entered by the state district court in this removed action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b) and to deny a temporary injunction.

The court has conducted a preliminary injunction hearing and reviewed the parties' written submissions and oral arguments. For the reasons given below, both the plaintiff's and the defendants' motions will be denied.

Appendix C

Background

Plaintiff Smith is employed by the Human Resources Department at the Port Arthur, Texas refinery operated by Star Enterprise, previously owned by Texaco. On December 6, 1996, Smith obtained a TRO from state court, which enjoined defendants from moving, altering or deleting any records which might pertain to Smith's (personal and as an anticipated class representative) claims of employment discrimination against Star Enterprise (and possibly Texaco).

Star Enterprise was formed as a joint venture under New York partnership law on January 1, 1989. Star Enterprise is owned 50% by an indirect subsidiary of Texaco and 50% by Saudi Refining, Inc.

The state court TRO pertains to Texaco because Texaco shares all employee performance and appraisal records with Star Enterprises to determine seniority or when employees chose to switch employment between these two companies. This occurs with some regularity, but not on a scheduled basis.

Specifically, Smith alleges that Star Enterprise's facially neutral employee appraisal and promotion system discriminates against him and other African-American employees. At the preliminary injunction hearing held before this court, it was determined that of about 50 people at Star Enterprise's nationwide human resources group only 1 or 2 are African-Americans. The evidence also showed that while between 17 to 21 people worked in Star Enterprise's Port Arthur facility's Human Resources Department, Smith was the only African-American in that department since 1984. Despite having high qualifications, a Master's Degree in Public Administration with

an emphasis in Budgeting and Personnel Services, Smith was the only employee in the Star Enterprise's Port Arthur facility's Human Resources Department who has not been promoted since 1985, a period of 11 years. Other persons who are caucasian, but with less educational background and with less seniority have been promoted, received raises, and given supervisory positions during those 11 years. But not Smith.

The evidence also showed that even as the state court issued its TRO on December 6, 1996, Star Enterprise attempted to move certain files from the "Old Records Room" in the Port Arthur plant to Tulsa, Oklahoma. The record indicates that but for Smith's efforts to enforce the TRO, Star Enterprise would have moved out of Texas to a Texaco records storage facility in Tulsa, Oklahoma certain employment records, possibly essential for making Smith's case, and certainly relevant to the claim or the defense. Texaco has the exclusive control of the Tulsa records center.

Discussion

1. This Case was Properly Removed to Federal Court

A defendant may remove a state court action to federal court if such an action could have been filed in the federal court originally. 28 U.S.C. §1441; *Aaron v. National Union Fire Ins. Co.*, 876 F. 2d 1157, 1160-1161 (5th Cir. 1989). When, as in the present case, there is no diversity jurisdiction, a federal question must appear on the face of the plaintiff's "well-pleaded complaint" for removal to be proper. *Id.*; *see also Carpenter v. Wichita Falls Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 44 F. 3d 362, 366 (5th Cir. 1995) ("A defendant . . . must show that a federal right is an element, and an essential one, of the plaintiff's cause of action.") (citations

omitted). The general rule, thus, is that a federal defense to a state law claim does not create removal jurisdiction. *Aaron*, 876 F. 2d at 1161.

In the present case, the plaintiff's pleading in the state court action, on its face, asserts an essentially federal claim. (See Appendix) The relevant portion of the plaintiff's pleading alleges:

> Defendants have engaged and are continuing to engage in unfair and racially motivated discriminatory practices against Plaintiff and other African-American employees of Star Enterprise. There are discriminatory practices and policies at Defendants' facilities that determine promotions, advancement opportunities and compensation which **apply Company-wide throughout the United States.** The specific practice includes "facially-neutral" decision-making systems that, in their application, have a disproportionate adverse impact on African-American employees.

Plaintiff's Application for Temporary Restraining Order at III (emphasis added).

Defendants properly point out that the above-quoted allegation states a cause of action which is exclusively federal in nature. 42 U.S.C. § 1981 makes it unlawful for an employer to discriminate on the basis of race in promotion and wage decisions. *Page v. U.S. Industries*, 726 F. 2d 1038 (5th Cir. 1984); *Boykin v. Georgia Pacific Corp.*, 706 F.2d 1384 (5th Cir. 1983). A prima facie case of such racial discrimination may be shown by demonstrating that African-Americans are "disparately impacted" by the employer's wage and promotion policies; that

is, "Where gross statistical disparities can be shown, they alone may . . . constitute prima facie proof of a pattern or practice of discrimination."[1] *Boykin*, 706 F.2d at 1390 (quoting *Hazelwood School Dist. V. United States*, 433 U.S. 299, 307-08, 97 S. Ct. 2736, 2741 (1977)).

Indeed, when the plaintiff alleges that Star Enterprise's promotion policies where determined by:

> **'facially-neutral' decision-making systems that, in their application, have a disproportionate adverse impact on African-American employees,**

he conforms perfectly to the Fifth Circuit's requirements for pleading the issue of disparate impact under section 1981:

> **A prima facie case of disparate impact must be shown by identification of a neutral employment practice coupled with proof of its discriminatory impact on one class of employees in the employer's workforce.**

---

1. This court is aware that Title VII also prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of race. *See* 42 U.S.C. §2000e. However, Title VII establishes an administrative procedure — i) file timely charge with the EEOC; ii) receive notice of right to sue — which a complaining employee must follow before filing a lawsuit in federal court. *Alexander v. Gardner-Denver Co.*, 415 U.S. 36, 47, 94 S. Ct. 1011, 1019 (1974); 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5(b), (c), (e). Because the plaintiff failed to plead the procedural prerequisites for a federal lawsuit under Title VII, this court cannot construe a plausible federal question over this lawsuit under Title VII. However, a disparate impact claim may be made under section 1981 even if such a claim may not be brought pursuant to Title VII. *Page v. U.S. Industries, Inc.*, 726 F.2d 1038, 1041 n.2 (5th Cir. 1984).

Page, 726 F. 2d at 1053 (emphasis added). Accordingly, a section 1981 claim is clearly discernable from the face of the plaintiff's pleadings.

While the plaintiff argues that there is no federal question jurisdiction because an employment discrimination case may be brought under the Texas Commission on Human Rights Act (TCHRA), Tex. Lab. Code Ann. §§21.001 et seq., it is fatal to his argument that he alleges that Star Enterprise's discrimination practices were **"Company-wide throughout the United States,"**[2] while TCHRA pertains to Texas employers only. Tex. Lab. Code Ann. §§21.001. Thus, a federal question, specifically a section 1981 claim, necessarily appears on the face of the plaintiff's pleading. Therefore, the plaintiff's Motion to Remand is in all things denied.

2. Preliminary Injunction

This court may grant a preliminary injunction if: "(1) the movant has a substantial likelihood of eventual success on the merits; (2) irreparable injury will be suffered unless the injunction issues; (3) the threatened injury to the movant outweighs the damage which the injunction may cause the opponent; and (4) the injunction would not be adverse to the public interest." *Productos Carnic, S.A. v. Cent. Am. Beef, Etc.*, 621 F.2d 683 (5th Cir. 1980).

---

2. During a hearing before this court the plaintiff has alleged that such discriminatory practices may occur not merely in Port Arthur, Texas, but also at Star Enterprise's refineries in Delaware City, Delaware, and Convent, Louisiana, and in Star Enterprise's principal marketing facility in Atlanta, Georgia.

Appendix C

a. Success on the Merits.

The court finds that the evidence presented at the hearing on December 20, 1996 shows that the plaintiff met his burden of showing a likelihood of success on the merits. Statistical evidence may be used to prove that a subjective promotional system has a classwide discriminatory impact. *Page*, 726 F. 2d at 1046-1047. This court finds it startling that of at least 50 people in Star Enterprise's nationwide human resources group only one or possibly two are African-Americans. Though there were between 17 to 21 people in the Star Enterprise's Port Arthur facility's Human Resources Department, Smith was the only African-American to work in that department since 1984. Despite having high qualifications, a Master's Degree in Public Administration with an emphasis in Budgeting and Personnel Services, Smith, who is forty-two was the only employee in the Star Enterprise's Port Arthur facility's Human Resources Department who has not been promoted since 1985, a period of 11 years.[3] At the very least, this court is persuaded that there is a substantial likelihood that Smith will succeed on the merits were he to bring a section 1981 claim.

b. Irreparable Injury.

The evidence before this court indicates that on December 6, 1996, or the day on which the state court issued its TRO, Star Enterprise has attempted to move certain files from its "Old Records Room" in the Port Arthur refinery to Tulsa, Oklahoma

3. Even if *Brown v. Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 294, 75 S. Ct. 753 (1955) (decided when the plaintiff was an infant), had eradicated race discrimination once and for all (wishful thinking) this court cannot help but wonder that given the evidence before it whether Smith, 42, could possibly assert a cognizable claim of age discrimination.

for storage in the Texaco records center. The evidence shows that the files which Star Enterprises attempted to move might have been essential for making the plaintiff's case. It is also clear that but for Smith notifying Star Enterprise of the state court's TRO, documents which could prove his case would have been removed from Port Arthur, Texas. If any documents relevant to the plaintiff's discrimination claim are removed, destroyed, or altered, the plaintiff and the class he anticipates he will represent will likely suffer irreparable harm in proving their racial discrimination claim.

c. Balancing the Equities.

Defendants argue that compliance with the injunction might cause more harm than good, viz. disruption of ordinary business activity. To accommodate the defendants' concerns, the court will modify the original state court TRO to permit the moving of certain documents, and certain notations concerning payroll, if doing so is in the ordinary and usual course of the defendants' business; provided, however, that the plaintiffs' rights to inspect documents relevant to their race discrimination case shall not be impaired. Moreover, to mitigate the high costs associated with electronic document storage, the court will permit defendants to delete electronic records in the ordinary and usual course of business; provided, however, that hard copy records be made and kept of any and all electronic records of the various Human Resources records, as well as any new data used to report various actions, and the status of employees to any governmental authority, state local, or federal, if the defendants choose to delete such records. With such modifications, the threat of harm to the plaintiffs outweighs any harm to the defendants which the injunction might cause.

Appendix C

d. Public Policy

Sound public policy abhors racial discrimination in employment promotions. Indeed, such discrimination is insidious, and violates our sense of human decency. Accordingly, an injunction which would enable the plaintiff to litigate fully and adequately his race discrimination claim fosters sound public policy.

Conclusion

For the reasons given above, the plaintiffs' Motion to Remand is in all things denied and the defendants' Motions to Dissolve the Temporary Restraining Order and Deny a Temporary Injunction are denied.

Signed this 2nd day of January, 1997.

s/ Howell Cobb
Howell Cobb
United States District Judge

Appendix C

Appendix

42 U.S.C. § 1981. Equal rights under the law

(a) Statement of equal rights

All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States **shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts** . . . and to the **full and equal benefit** of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is **enjoyed by white citizens** . . .

(b) "Make and enforce contracts" defined

For purposes of this section, the term **"make and enforce contracts"** includes the **making, performance, modification, and termination of contracts**, and the **enjoyment of all benefits, privileges, terms, and conditions of contractual relationship.**

(c) Protection against impairment

The rights protected by this section are protected **against impairment by nongovernmental discrimination** and impairment under color of State law.

Paragraph III of Plaintiff's Petition

Defendants have engaged and are continuing to engage in **unfair and racially motivated discriminatory**

practices against Plaintiff and other African-American employees of Star Enterprise. There are **discriminatory practices** and policies at Defendants' facilities that **determine promotions, advancement opportunities and compensation** which apply Company-wide **throughout the United States**. The specific practice includes "facially-neutral" decision-making systems that, in their application, have a disproportionate **adverse impact on African-American employees**. More specifically Plaintiff, Matthews Smith has been subjected to discriminatory practices and policies in Defendants' evaluation system, job posting, compensation/pay-grade systems and promotions. By using these discriminatory practices and policies, Defendants have engaged in a **pattern and practice of intentional discrimination against Plaintiff and other African-American employees of Star Enterprise.**

APPENDIX D — DOCUMENT PRESERVATION ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, BEAUMONT DIVISION FILED MARCH 4, 1997

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BEAUMONT DIVISION

1:96-CV-0749

MATTHEWS SMITH, ET AL,

vs.

TEXACO INC., AND STAR ENTERPRISE

Document Preservation Order

Background

Before the court is the motion of plaintiffs Matthews Smith, et al, seeking a document preservation order. *See Manual on Complex Litigation* (3d Ed. 1995) §§ 21.442, 41.34, and § 33,53 at pp. 352 and 353. The court has considered all of the parties' written submissions and heard their oral argument. The plaintiffs' motion is in all things GRANTED.

This is one of three Document Preservation Orders entered this date in this action. None of the three orders shall be considered by the parties or by this court as a motion to produce any of the "Preserved Documents," or requiring any discovery until a discovery order is entered by the court after either agreement of the parties, or upon motion and hearing, if necessary. Compliance by the parties with this order shall not

be construed to waive any claims of confidentiality or privilege which any of the parties may make during the pendency of this case.

I. Definitions

1. "Texaco." The term "Texaco" means defendant Texaco, Inc., including defendant Texaco Inc.'s agents, servants, and any other person or entity acting for or on behalf of defendant Texaco Inc., or any person or entity having actual or constructive notice of this order.

2. "Preserved Documents." The term "Preserved Documents" means all documents, including documents in hard copy, drafts of documents (which can, and often do, evidence subjective intent), documents stored in computer memory, or electronic mail messages to or from Texaco, which relate to any claims based on the alleged racially discriminatory practices or defenses thereto, specifically including all documents relating to: i) promotions, ii) demotions, iii) compensation, iv) training, v) job assignments, vi) job transfers, vii) performance or character evaluations, viii) decisions to hire or terminate employment, and ix) all alleged claims of retaliation by Texaco and Star Enterprise against African-American employees, who have attempted to obtain managerial, supervisory, or professional positions with Star Enterprise.

"Preserved Documents" do not include Texaco's electronic back-up system, voice mail messages, and additional copies of an original document upon which no further information has been noted and no existing information has been deleted.

Appendix D

II. Texaco's Duties with Respect to Preserved Documents

1. Texaco shall not destroy, alter, amend, change, delete, or make any new notations on Preserved Documents retained by Texaco as of the date of this order except as provided in Sections II.2 and II.3.

2. Texaco may elect to keep Preserved Documents received or sent in electronic mail form, or stored in computer memory, in either electronic or hard copy form.

3. Texaco may make any new additions to or notations on Preserved Documents which Texaco makes in its usual and ordinary course of business, as determined by both industry standards and any internal business standards or policies which Texaco has previously imposed on itself.

III. Moving of Preserved Documents

1. Texaco may move Preserved Documents only if doing so is necessary to advance Texaco's usual and ordinary business purposes, as determined by both industry standards and any internal business standards or policies which Texaco has previously imposed on itself.

2. Texaco shall prepare, keep, and preserve logs of any and all Texaco documents, which have been moved or which will be moved *from* Star Enterprise's record storage facilities in Texas, Louisiana, Delaware, and Georgia *to* Texaco's facility in Tulsa, Oklahoma. The logs shall be in the usual format that Texaco uses to log and index its documents, and no additional "logging and indexing" will be required. However, both Texaco and Star Enterprise shall retain any and all originals and copies of logs

or indexes generated by Texaco's usual and ordinary methods of "logging and indexing."

IV. Objections to Inefficient Record Keeping

1. Any party contending the Document Control Orders entered by the court are unduly burdensome, expensive, inappropriate, or incapable of being adhered to, may file a motion requesting the court to designate an electronic systems analyst to review the electronic communications system, the information sought to be protected and retained, and the objectives of this order; and thereafter, to report to the parties and to the court his or her recommendations for the most efficient means and methods to be employed and effectuated at the lowest possible cost to the parties, and the least burdensome upon the ongoing operations of Star Enterprise and Texaco.

V. Initial Disclosure

1. Within 20 days of this order, counsel for each party will submit to opposing counsel a plan for complying with initial disclosure requirements of the Local Rules of the United States District Court, Eastern District of Texas. Such initial disclosure shall be completed by May 1, 1997, unless otherwise ordered by the court. The logs of documents referred to in Section III will be produced upon their completion by Texaco, which may take somewhat more time. If a party objects to the initial disclosure proposed, the court may schedule a hearing to resolve such objections.

Appendix D

VI. Changes and Clarifications

1. Any party may seek changes or clarification of this order by motion to the court, upon good cause shown.

Signed this 4th day of March, 1997.

s/ Howell Cobb
HOWELL COBB
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPENDIX E — PER CURIAM OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT DENYING PETITION FOR REHEARING FILED AUGUST 5, 1997

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 97-40087

MATTHEWS SMITH

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

TEXACO, INC; Et Al

Defendants

STAR ENTERPRISE; TEXACO, INC

Defendant - Appellant

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Beaumont

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING AND SUGGESTION FOR REHEARING EN BANC

(Opinion 6/3/97, 5 Cir., _____, _____ F.3d _____)

Before WIENER and PARKER, Circuit Judges, and LITTLE, District Judge.*

---

*United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, sitting by designation.

Appendix E

PER CURIAM:

(✓) The Petition for Rehearing is DENIED and no member of this panel nor judge in regular active service on the court having requested that the court be polled on Rehearing En Banc, (FRAP and Local Rule 35) the Suggestion for Rehearing En Banc is also DENIED.

* * *

ENTERED FOR THE COURT:

s/ illegible
United States Circuit Judge

APPENDIX F — SCHEDULING ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY IN THE MATTER OF *IN RE THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE COMPANY OF AMERICA SALES PRACTICES LITIGATION*, MASTER DOCKET NO. 95-4704 ENTERED SEPTEMBER 15, 1995

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

MASTER DOCKET NO. 95-4704
(Multi District Litigation No. DL-1061)

In re THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE COMPANY OF AMERICA SALES PRACTICES LITIGATION

SCHEDULING ORDER

It appearing that the cases listed on Attachment A may merit special attention as complex litigation, it is on this 15th day of September, 1995, ORDERED as follows:

1. *Initial Conference.* All parties shall appear for a conference with the undersigned on the 13th day of October, 1995, at 11:00 a.m. in Courtroom 4B, Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Courthouse, 50 Walnut Street, Newark, New Jersey.

(a) *Attendance.* To minimize costs and facilitate a manageable conference, parties are not required to attend the conference, and parties with similar interests are expected to agree to the extent practicable on a single attorney to act on their joint behalf at the conference. A party will not, by designating an attorney to represent its interests at the conference, be precluded from other representation during the litigation; and attendance at the

conference will not waive objections to jurisdiction, venue or service.

(b) *Service List.* This Order is being mailed to the persons on Attachment A, which has been prepared from the list of counsel making appearances with the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation. Counsel on this list are requested to forward a copy of the Order to other attorneys who should be notified of the conference. A corrected service list will be prepared after the conference.

(c) *Other Participants.* Persons who are not named as parties in this litigation but may later be joined as parties or are parties in related litigation pending in other federal and state courts are invited to attend in person or by counsel.

2. *Purposes; Agenda.* The conference will be held for the purposes specified in U.S. Dist. Ct. Rules, D.N.J., Rules 15(a), 15(b), 15(d), and Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f), and subject to the sanctions prescribed in Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(f). The items listed in the *Manual for Complex Litigation, Third*, sections 21.21 and 40.1, shall, to the extent applicable, constitute a tentative agenda. Counsel are encouraged to advise the Court as soon as possible of any items that should be added to the agenda.

3. *Preparations for Conference.*

(a) *Procedures for Complex Litigation.* Counsel are expected to familiarize themselves with the *Manual for Complex Litigation, Third*, and be prepared at the conference to suggest procedures that will facilitate the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of this litigation.

(b) *Preliminary Reports.* Counsel will submit to the Court by October 6, 1995, a brief written statement indicating their preliminary understanding of the facts involved in the litigation and the critical factual and legal issues. These statements will not be filed with the Clerk, will not be binding, will not waive claims or defenses, and may not be offered in evidence against a party in later proceedings.

(c) *List of Affiliated Companies and Counsel.* To assist the Court in identifying any problems of recusal or disqualification, counsel will submit to the Court by October 6, 1995, a list of companies affiliated with the parties and all counsel associated in the litigation.

(e) *List of Pending Motions.* Counsel's statement shall list all pending motions.

(f) *List of Related Cases.* Counsel's statement shall list all related cases pending in state or federal court and their current status, to the extent known.

4. *Interim Measures.* Unless otherwise ordered by the Court:

(a) *Admission of Counsel.* Attorneys admitted to practice and in good standing in any United States District Court are admitted *pro hac vice* in this litigation. Association of local co-counsel is not required.

(b) *Pleadings.* Each defendant is granted an extension of time for responding by motion or answer to the complaints until a date to be set at the conference.

(c) *Pending and New Discovery*. Pending the conference, all outstanding disclosure and discovery proceedings are stayed and no further discovery shall be initiated. This order does not (1) preclude voluntary informal discovery regarding the identification and location of relevant documents and witnesses; (2) preclude parties from stipulating to the conduct of a deposition that has already been scheduled; (3) prevent a party from voluntarily making disclosure, responding to an outstanding discovery request under Fed. R. Civ. P. 33, 34 or 36; or (4) authorize a party to suspend its efforts in gathering information needed to respond to a request under Fed. R. Civ. P. 33, 34 or 36. Relief from this stay may be granted for good cause shown, such as the ill health of a proposed deponent.

(d) *Preservation of Records*. Each party shall preserve all documents and other records containing information potentially relevant to the subject matter of this litigation. Each party shall also preserve any physical evidence or potential evidence and shall not conduct any testing that alters the physical evidence without notifying opposing counsel and, unless counsel stipulate to the test, without obtaining the Court's permission to conduct the test. Subject to further order of the Court, parties may continue routine erasures of computerized data pursuant to existing programs, but they shall (1) immediately notify opposing counsel about such programs and (2) preserve any printouts of such data. Requests for relief from this directive will receive prompt attention from the Court.

(e) *Motions*. No motion shall be filed under Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, 12 or 56 without leave of Court and unless it includes a certificate that the movant has conferred with opposing

counsel in a good faith effort to resolve the matter without Court action.

(f) *Order of Transferor Courts.* All orders by transferor courts imposing dates for pleadings or discovery are vacated.

5. *Later Filed Cases.* This Order shall also apply to related cases later filed in, removed to, or transferred to this Court.

s/ Alfred M. Wolin
ALFRED M. WOLIN, U.S.D.J.

Appendix F

ATTACHMENT A

In re THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE COMPANY OF AMERICA SALES PRACTICES LITIGATION
Multidistrict Litigation No. 1061
MASTER DOCKET NO. 96-4704

ARIZONA

Lujan v. Prudential - No. 4-95-207

Richard D. Burris, Esq.
2525 E. Broadway, Suite 102
Tucson, AZ 85716

CONNECTICUT

Kuchas v. Prudential - No. 3-95-353

Paul Windels, III, Esq.
Perry & Windels
150 Broadway
New York, NY 10119

FLORIDA MIDDLE

Young v. Prudential - No. 3-95-348

Karla R. Spaulding, Esq.
James, Hoyer & Newcomer
One Urban Centre - Suite 147
4830 W. Kennedy Boulevard
Tampa, FL 33609

Appendix F

ILLINOIS SOUTHERN

Harris v. Prudential - No. 3-95-203

Jay R. Tomerlin, Esq.
346 W. St. Louis Avenue
East Alton, IL 62024

Nicholson v. Prudential - No. 3-95-206

Mark C. Goldenberg, Esq.
Bono, Goldenberg, Hopkins & Bilbrey
2132 Pontoon Road
Granite City, IL 62040

Schulte v. Prudential - No. 3-95-412

Delmar O. Koebel, Esq.
6 Joshua Drive
O'Fallon, IL 62269

Weaver v. Prudential - No. 3-95-138

Neil J. Maune, Esq.
2013B Johnson Rd., Drawer 8
Granite City, IL 62040

KENTUCKY WESTERN

Gordon v. Prudential - No. 5-95-147

Kenneth W. Scott, Esq.
Scott & Jahn
7415 Burlington Pike
Florence, KY 41002

Appendix F

Martin v. Prudential - No. 5-95-30

J. Bruce Miller, Esq.
621 W. Main Street - 4th Floor
Louisville, KY 40202

MINNESOTA

Amlee v. Prudential - No. 3-95-380

Samuel D. Heins, Esq.
Heins, Mills & Olson
700 Northstar East
608 Second Avenue, South
Minneapolis, MN 55402

NEW JERSEY

Dorfner v. Prudential - No. 2-95-1107
Groth v. Prudential - No. 2-95-1104

Melvyn I. Weiss, Esq.
Milberg, Weiss, Bershad, Hynes & Lerach
One Pennsylvania Plaza
New York, NY 10119

Wachtler v. Prudential - No. 2-95-2473

Allyn Z. Lite, Esq.
Goldstein, Till, Lite & Reiken
744 Broad Street - Suite 600
Newark, NJ 07102

Appendix F

Zoller v. Prudential - No. 2-95-1093

Michael B. Hyman, Esq.
Much, Shelist, Freed, Denenberg & Ament
200 North LaSalle Street - Suite 2100
Chicago, IL 60601

NEW YORK SOUTHERN

Dugan v. Prudential - No. 1-94-1195

Steven Altman, Esq.
Ziegler, Ziegler & Altman
750 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022

NEW YORK WESTERN

Hunter v. Prudential - No. 1-95-364

Richard J. Lippes, Esq.
Allen, Lippes & Shonn
1260 Delaware Avenue
Buffalo, NY 14209

OHIO NORTHERN

Krell v. Prudential - No. 3-95-7419

Dennis E. Murray, Sr., Esq.
Murray & Murray
111 E. Shoreline Drive, Box 19
Sandusky, OH 44871

Appendix F

PENNSYLVANIA WESTERN

Price v. Prudential - No. 2-94-75

Howard A. Specter, Esq.
Koppers Building, 26th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

WEST VIRGINIA NORTHERN

Kittle v. Prudential - No. 1-95-96

Michael P. Malakoff, Esq.
Malakoff, Doyle & Finberg
The Frick Building - Suite 200
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE COMPANY

David A. Bell, Esq.
Porter, Wright, Morris & Arthur
1700 Huntington Building
925 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44115

Daniel C. Brown, Esq.
Katz, Kutter, Haigler, Alderman
106 E. College Ave., Box 1877
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Gordon G. Busdicker, Esq.
Faegre & Benson
2200 Norwest Center
90 S. Seventh Street
Minneapolis, MN 55401

Appendix F

Jose A. Cardenas, Esq.
Lewis & Roca
40 North Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Lorie A. Chaiten, Esq.
Sonneschein, Nath & Rosenthal
8000 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

William P. Frank, Esq.
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom
919 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022

John L. Gilbert, Esq.
Reed, Armstrong, Gorman, Coffey
125 N. Buchanan St., Box 247
Edwardsville, IL 62025

Alan E. Kraus, Esq.
Edward A. Zunz, Esq.
Riker, Danzig, Scherer, Hyland & Perretti
One Speedwell Avenue
Morristown, NJ 07962

John F. Smith, Esq.
Reed, Smith, Shaw & McClay
2500 One Liberty Place
1650 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Appendix F

Edward H. Stopher, Esq.
Boehl, Stopher & Graves
400 West Market St., Suite 2300
Louisville, KY 40202

Charles C. Warner, Esq.
Porter, Wright, Morris & Arthur
42 South High Street
Columbus, OH 43215